

## **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-7, 16, 18, 21-25, and 27-31 will remain pending in this application. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter added to claims 1, 16, and 25 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0046]-[0049] and [0057]-[0059].

Claims 16, 18, and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-7, 16, 18, and 21-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,795,071 ("Tracey et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,127 ("Cloud et al.").

### ***Interview Summary***

On May 19, 2008, Examiner Mark Radtke and Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Radtke stated that these claim amendments appeared to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections of record.

### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

Claims 16, 18, and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 16 to recite a processor and a memory. Claims 18 and 21-24 depend from claim 16 and also incorporate those limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16, 18, and 21-24 are directed to statutory subject matter, namely, an apparatus, and requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-7, 16, 18, and 21-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. The rejection is understood to be based in part on the premise that Cloud et al. teaches the following limitations, which are not disclosed in Tracey et al.:

"wherein the business process comprises different business processes;"

“matching the related service entities based on the service metadata;” and  
“combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities.”

Applicant notes that claim 26 was cancelled in a previous paper. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 recites the following limitations, among others:

“matching the related service entities based on the service metadata;”  
“combining the related service entities into a context entity that is a single entity derived from one or more service entities;” and  
“determining dynamic actions available on the related service entities based on the classification of the availability of the one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities, the available dynamic actions comprising an indication of whether a state change is available on each service entity within its corresponding different business process.”

By contrast, while Cloud et al. teaches “multiple disparate back end systems,” Applicant's review of Cloud et al. suggests that it teaches a message driven architecture that “decomposes a complex request into several individual transactions and recomposes the results of those transactions into one or more replies.” See column 7, lines 49-51. For example, in the example shown in Figure 2 of Cloud et al., “a request in the form of a message to approve a loan . . . would be decomposed into four different requests for information as defined by the request profile, one to retrieve a credit history, one to retrieve an account balance, one to retrieve credit card status and one to confirm bank fund availability to fund the loan.” See column 13, lines 41-47. “Once all of the replies to the separate transactions have been received back, the information is assembled into one or more reply messages and sent to the output reply manager 770 where it is queued for transmission to the client using the specified client agent.” See column 13, lines 51-55. Applicant submits that Cloud et al. teaches dividing a complex task into discrete units of work, dispatching the units of work, and composing one or more reply messages based on the results of the units of work.

Cloud et al. does not teach consolidation of service entities into a context entity. As explained at paragraph [0005] of the instant Specification, “The limited ability to access,

query, and manage service entities from within an application is particularly cumbersome when a document influences the management of related entities from different application services. For example, if the document causes a user to change the state of applicant entity 'John Smith' at the first application service and to change the state of loan entity 'John Smith' at the second application service, then the user must separately access each application service and separately identify each service entity at each application service. Separately identifying service entities at different application services is cumbersome because, even if the different service entities are related, the service entities may be defined at each application service by different sets of attributes. For example, while the first application service may define the applicant service entity by separate "first name" and "last name" attributes, the second application service may define the loan entity by an "applicant" attribute rather than by a name attribute." The invention as recited in claim 1 solves this problem by combining, for example, the applicant service entity and the loan entity into a single context entity. By contrast, while the system of Cloud et al. may divide a loan approval process into different units of work, there is no suggestion that the different entities acted on by the different units of work – as described at column 13, lines 44-47 (credit history, account balance, credit card status, bank fund availability) – are combined into a single context entity.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Tracey et al. nor Cloud et al. discloses the use of service metadata that includes a classification of an availability of one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities. Accordingly, the references also do not disclose "determining dynamic actions available on the related services entities based on the classification of the availability of the one or more actions performable in connection with the related service entities."

Thus, Tracey et al. and Cloud et al., considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 16 recites similar limitations to those recited in claim 1 and is therefore also patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. Claims 18 and 21-24 depend from claim

**DOCKET NO.:** 301410.1 / MSFT-1948  
**Application No.:** 10/648,507  
**Office Action Dated:** January 8, 2008

**PATENT**

16 and are patentable over Tracey et al. in view of Cloud et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 25 recites similar limitations to those recited in claim 1. In addition, claim 25 recites further limitations beyond those recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 is patentable at least for the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claims 27-31 depend from claim 25 and are patentable over the prior art of record at least by reason of their dependency.

Based at least on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record and requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**DOCKET NO.:** 301410.1 / MSFT-1948  
**Application No.:** 10/648,507  
**Office Action Dated:** January 8, 2008

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: July 8, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439